3

Indigenization of Psychology in India*

Knowledge has its own anchorage in tradition, history, and society. Historical and social forces operate in its production and utilization. As Singh (1986) has observed, production of knowledge is socially conditioned since the categories of science, its tools for the perception of reality, are mediated by social forces, culture, and tradition. The social conditioning of knowledge is revealed by the extent to which the concepts, methods, and priority areas of research have the imprint of history and social forces operative in society (p. ix).

This position has not gone unchallenged. The diehard universalists and absolutists assert that there is no question of cultural relativity about knowledge. With the political and economic dominance which the industrially advanced west gained over the rest of the world, universalism in knowledge came to be equated with the theories, principles, and data generated in the countries of Europe and North America. These were supposed to have panhuman verities and were utilized to explain behaviour not only of the people and societies where they had been generated, but also of other peoples and societies irrespective of the differences in their culture, tradition, and historical antecedents. This position is seriously questioned especially in the social sciences. The socio-cultural context and history are emphasized and the *assumed* universality of the theories and principles developed in the west has begun to be questioned and alternatives are suggested. Just as in general development, the "endogenous" model is considered more efficacious and desirable than the adoption of western models, in the field of knowledge, servility and dependence on the west is sought to be replaced by "indigenous" knowledge.

Indigenization is a global phenomenon. Neither it is confined to a few countries or regions of the world nor to the social sciences

Copyrighted material

Scanned by CamScanner

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

only though in some regions and in certain disciplines, the need for indigenization is greater. In the erstwhile colonial countries which had been for centuries under the domination of the west, there is a strong trend towards *decolonization* of knowledge and a call for "self-rule" in the sciences. Reflections of this trend can be discerned in the powerful intellectual movement for Islamizing knowledge in Pakistan (Al Faruqi, 1982) and other Muslim countries, teaching of Vedic mathematics in some states in India, and popularity in some academic circles of treatises on the physical and positive sciences of ancient Hindus, in many developing countries there is growing scepticism—even outright opposition—to toeing western technological developments. Instead there is a plea for "appropriate" technology. In the Philippines, the trend is most clearly visible in psychology in what has been termed as "decoding the Filipino psyche" (Enriquez, 1987) or the "contextualization of psychology in the Philippine setting" (p. 276) and a plea for a Filipino psychology or *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* (Enriquez, 1982). Even in the west, a distinct European social psychology has become a reality (Moscovici, 1972); and in Canada, social psychology in the Canadian context with a distinct orientation and emphasis has evolved (Berry, 1974; Berry & Wilde, 1972).

As expected, the trend towards indigenization is clearly visible and strongest in the social sciences. In particular, modern psychology being the most "foreign" of the social sciences, the need for indigenization is expressed loudly. The inapplicability of psychological concepts and tools forged in the western context is frequently emphasized and their wholesale transfer/transplantation to countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America is questioned. It is contended that psychological knowledge should be based on culturally derived categories and appropriate instruments of data collection, and should concern itself with problems that really matter rather than with those derived from a perusal of western research literature or those that are in fashion in the west. It is, however, to be noted that this does not apply to those areas of psychology that deal mainly with the biological and physiological aspects of behaviour in which culture specific factors play but a very minor role. Thus, in fields like physiological psychology and ergonomics, universality of principles and theories is seldom questioned. On the other hand, in fields like social psychology, organizational behaviour, personality, clinical, and developmental psychology where culture and sociogenic variables operate as significant determinants, indigenization is viewed not only as desirable but also inevitable. Even in certain aspects of perception and cognition, characteristic habits of information processing seem to be inculcated by culture (Cole, Gay & Glick, 1968; Das &

Scanned by CamScanner

ch Images Maps Play YouTube News Gmail Drive More priya.malhan23@gmail.com
Books Added to Favorites Write review Contents

Molloy, 1975); and the emphasis on cultural variables and indigenization is believed to be necessary. As Berry, Poortinga, Segall, and Desan (1992) have concluded, "not all perceptual variables are equally likely to show cultural differences. On basic sensory functions, equal level of performance is to be expected for all cultural groups. But at higher levels of stimulus complexity the pattern of findings changes" (p. 160). In the case of the latter, the indigenous approach appears fruitful if the goal of universal verity of psychological principles is to be attained rather than merely assumed.

"Why" of Indigenization

Before delving into the nature of indigenization, factors that have led to the adoption of an indigenous approach to psychology in India are discussed. In order to provide the necessary perspective, its historical background is outlined. In India, the roots of psychology go deep into the vast storehouse of knowledge embodied in ancient religious and philosophical treatises, in epics and in folklores. They contain valuable materials concerning the nature of man, his personality, and social and interpersonal interactions. But the psychological knowledge contained therein is based on speculations and intuitions of seers and can hardly be regarded as "scientific" in the strict sense of the term. Thus, as a part of general transfer of knowledge, when modern scientific psychology, based on positivistic, materialistic, mechanistic, and empirical orientations of the west, was transplanted to India during the second decade of the century, it was imported as a "ready-made intellectual package" (Nandy, 1974, p. 7). It swept away psychology enshrined in Indian tradition and ancient texts and along with that there was an uncritical acceptance of concepts, theories, and techniques used in the west. Shanmugam (1972) who reviewed the study of personality researches for the first ICSSR Survey, rightly concluded that "when we look for significant contributions from Indian psychologists, we are disappointed, since most of the studies reported are based on western models" (p. 302). This was true of almost all the branches, and of concepts, theories, and psychological instruments used for data collection. Whatever constructs and principles became popular at a particular time in the west, psychologists in India readily adopted them without re-defining them or examining their applicability (Sinha, 1984b, p. 199). In fact, they worked with them for years—long after they had gone out of fashion in the country of their origin. As Diaz-Guerrero (1977) has

Scanned by CamScanner

rightly observed in the context of the developing countries, such borrowing had done precious little to stimulate the development of local instruments that would at least measure socio-cultural characteristics of the country and had been completely blind to measures sensitive to idiosyncratic cultural and personality dynamics. The outcome was proliferation of psychological literature and tests that were frequently irrelevant in our cultural context. They lacked creativity, and were imitative and replicative. It is, therefore, not surprising that modern psychology in India is often called a "Euro-American product" (Campbell, 1968; Sinha, 1977, 1984a) with very little concern for the social reality as it prevailed in the country (Sinha, 1988/1993, p. 78).

Mohanty (1988) has content-analyzed papers published during 1984 and 1985 in one of the few research journals in psychology in the country that is published regularly, viz., *Psychological Studies*, and observed that in 85.68 per cent of the cases, the main source was an American journal or dissertation; in 8.14 per cent it was a non-American (European or Japanese) international journal; and in 6.16 per cent of the papers no definite source could be determined. An analysis of originality of the research idea contained in the papers revealed that 83.67 per cent were replications or near-replications of works of their overseas (almost always American) colleagues. Within these, 26.53 per cent were exact replications with no appreciable change from the source, and 57.14 per cent with conscious modification of some of the variables. Only 8.16 per cent reported a genuine critical study and another 8.16 per cent were considered original and were based on some typically Indian context. Naturally, the author regards the average Indian psychologist as "only an uncritical, delayed, but faithful reflection of his American counterpart" (Mohanty, 1988, p. 1). As a result, the psychology that he created seemed to be composed of not-so-mindful, not-so-original and aimless scribblings of ideas picked up from North American psychology outdated by at least a decade—thus earning him the ephitet—Yankee Doodler (p. 1). Most psychologists in India—a large number of them being trained in the west—derived their inspiration from outside which hampered the healthy growth of the subject in the country. References cited in their studies, as the analysis by J.B.P. Sinha (1976) of four books on industrial occupational psychology pertaining to the 1960s has shown, were mostly foreign and an insignificant number, if any, were of their compatriots. Therefore, it is not surprising that the subject remained for long at best a pale carbon copy of western and largely American psychology with very little concern for the social reality in the country. This subservience sometimes went to the ridiculous length of conceptualizing Indian social phenomena in

Scanned by CamScanner

American terms, for example, caste as if it were race, communalism as anti-semitism, and the untouchables as the American blacks, as Nandy (1974, p. 8) has pointed out.

The "foreignness" of the studies divorced the subject both from the traditional system of psychology and the rich storehouse of concepts and ideas which could have provided strong cultural roots as well as linked them to the Indian social reality. Very rightly, the Standing Committee for Psychology of the ICSSR voiced its "concerns about foreignness of social science research in India—in the field of psychology in particular" (ICSSR, 1973, p. 43). Such studies were neither theoretically sound, nor had relevance to the problems of the country.

Indian psychologists looking to the west, especially the USA, for academic recognition and patronage—because they were conducive factors in their career advancement and promotion—naturally adopted the prevailing disciplinary fashion. They accepted the salience and priorities prevailing in western psychology at the time without bothering to examine them in the light of the needs of the country. As Sinha (1986, p. 111) has observed, "the western models and ideas took Indian researchers away from such ideas that might have struck roots in the Indian soil." It frequently led to a shift in the focus of the local scholar away from his own country and its problems, and distracted him from core issues. This was the state of psychology especially during the pre-independence phase and during the decade or so of post-independence expansion.

Immediately after independence, there was a growth of national pride and a gradual awareness of a distinct identity among scholars who began to feel the need for "outgrowing the alien framework" (Sinha, 1980/1987). Initially, though there was an effort to study variables operating in the Indian situation, the topics continued to remain those which were current in the west and the theoretical framework utilized was also western (J.B.P. Sinha, 1976). The 1960s marked the phase of problem-oriented research during which relating psychological research to problems arising from rapid socio-economic development and change, and those that were vital to the country were articulated. Topics like psychological dimensions of poverty, agro-economic development, health and family welfare, diffusion of innovation—to mention only a few—started to attract increasing attention. But the existing psychological theories and principles proved inadequate. Being the products of a specific milieu of the west with parameters like university, impersonality, stability, literacy and a host of shared beliefs and attitudes which were not available in the developing countries, their application for understanding and predicting social behaviour was very limited (Jahoda, 1973). Jahoda (1980/1983, p. 30) has rightly

Copyrighted material

Scanned by CamScanner

ch Images Maps Play YouTube News Gmail Drive More priya.malhan23@gmail.com
Books Added to Favorites Write review Contents

asserted that social psychology is still very weak as regards theories relevant to studies in developing countries.

It was, therefore, inevitable that some Indian scholars began to question the appropriateness of the theories developed in the west, based entirely on western data, and articulated the need for developing the subject rooted in the socio-cultural context of the country. Thus, not only was there an urge to make the subject relevant to meet the needs of a changing society, but also for appropriate theoretical framework and tools of research suited to the situation prevailing in the country (Sinha, 1986, p. 63).

In this context, it should be noted that modern psychology, which with considerable justification is equated with psychology that has developed and flourished in the United States, is regarded by many as an "indigenous psychology of the West" (Rudmin, 1987, p. 1). Even in the USA psychologists are becoming increasingly aware of the "monoculture" nature of North American psychology (Kennedy, Scheirer & Rogers, 1984). It has been observed that Canada, the Philippines and some countries in Europe have shown trends towards developing a psychology in their own cultural context.

In India, growing disillusionment with the foreign roots of psychology, realization of the non-applicability of its concepts and tools for research in the radically different socio-cultural contexts, its "irrelevance to vital issues facing the country and failure to make a thrust in the national life (Pareek, 1980b, p. ix) were indicative of signs of growing crisis in psychology". As a result, the process of indigenization has been unleashed, and since the mid-1970s, there has been a strong trend towards the development of the discipline suited to the needs and socio-cultural context of the country. Pareek (1981) has indicated that there has been an effort to contribute both to the development of theory and to provide effective solutions to social problems. Moghaddam (1987) has rightly observed that "probably the most important factor shaping indigenous third world psychology is the demand that it contributes directly to the development effort of third-world societies" (p. 918).

Definition and Nature of Indigenization

Before discussing indigenization of psychology in India, it is necessary to clarify the concept. Though it is quite frequently used in social science literature, the expression "indigenization" does not occur in any standard dictionary. Since it is derived from the term "indigenous", we begin with its import. According to the *Concise*

Scanned by CamScanner

Oxford Dictionary, "indigenous" refers to flora and fauna and means "produced naturally in a region; belonging naturally to the soil". Extending its biological meaning to the sphere of epistemology, it would refer to those elements of knowledge that have been generated in a country or culture, and have developed therein as against those that are imported or borrowed from elsewhere. According to this view, concepts, ideas, materials, methods, and techniques that have their origin in the region or have traditional roots and constitute the cultural creations would be regarded as indigenous. Second, due to contact and communication with other cultures, countries or regions, many concepts, theories, and methods are implanted and borrowed from outside. These usually undergo transformations so that they suit the characteristics of the region. Thus, in its second aspect, it implies the process of changing or modifying the imported elements so that they become adapted, natural, or appropriate to the region. Strictly speaking, "indigenization" refers to the second aspect, which implies the way in which an element of knowledge is transformed so as to make it natural or suited to the special features of the socio-cultural setting of the country or region (Sinha, 1988/1993, p. 81). In the context of psychology, indigenization would mean the transformation of scientific psychology that has been borrowed from the west in such a manner that it takes on a character suited to the social and cultural milieu of the country. Puhan and Sahoo (1991) have equated it with assimilation and gradual adaptation. It is a "route" to what Azuma (1984) has called "appropriate psychology". In other words, it is a kind of *contextualization* of the discipline, i.e., blending of foreign models, theories, and methods with indigenous ones (Adair, 1989) to make them culturally appropriate. As Adair (1992a) has pointed out, "an indigenous psychology gradually develops from blending of an imported discipline with increasing attention to unique elements within that culture" (p. 3). In one of his earlier papers entitled "Integration of modern psychology with Indian thought", Sinha (1965, p. 5) has viewed the process as a "converging of two lines", or systems of psychological knowledge, and as an integrative process.

From the above exposition, it is evident that indigenization has two facets or forms. In its first aspect, it is purely the product of a culture and implies utilization in a particular discipline of concepts and categories that belong to that culture, and those that emanate from the social and cultural milieu itself. In its second aspect, it reflects the interaction of the local or cultural elements with concepts, theories, and methods imported from external sources. In other words, it is a kind of integrative or assimilative process. These two can respectively be designated as "internal indigenization" and

Scanned by CamScanner

"indigenization of the exogenous"—a distinction that corresponds to Enriquez's (1987) "indigenization from within" and "indigenization from without".

If we study the definitions of indigenization advanced by Adair and his colleagues, both aspects of the process are emphasized. But the definition propounded by Adair, Puhan, and Vohra (1993) seems to emphasize only the first aspect: "In the context of social research, indigenisation emanates from, adequately represents, and reflects back the culture in which behaviour is studied, rather than a discipline that is imported from, and primarily addresses Developed World models" (p. 150).

In an earlier definition, however, Adair (1992a, p. 62) has confined it largely to the second aspect of indigenization. It is regarded as a process of taking development from elsewhere (such as US psychology) and introducing modifications to make it fit the new culture. It is obvious that the expression refers to a set of complex processes and phenomena that are interrelated. While dealing with them, however, scholars have not maintained a distinction between the various facets thereby leading to a certain amount of confusion. It is to be noted that though Adair is aware of both the facets of indigenization, his analysis of the process is confined mainly to the second aspect.

Different Forms of Indigenization

So far as the development of psychology in India is concerned, both kinds of indigenization are evidenced. Before going into the details, some other differentiations of the process will be discussed.

Structural, Substantive and Theoretical

Krishna Kumar (1979, pp. 104–105) has differentiated between three types of indigenization: structural, substantive, and theoretical. The first is defined with reference to the institutional and organizational capabilities of a nation for the production and development of knowledge that is relevant. As far as psychology is concerned, there are very few departments and institutions in the country with the professed and explicit goal of focusing research on social and national issues that are peculiar to the country or developing psychology based on indigenous concepts and categories. They are largely geared to the mainstream psychology,

Copyrighted material

Scanned by CamScanner

and generally follow the current priorities and are inspired by the problems that are cogitating their counterparts in the west. There are, of course, a few exceptions. Some departments have linked their research activities to contemporary social and national issues like poverty, intergroup relations, social inequality, social change and national development, and are geared to psychological knowledge that is culturally relevant. Their number is not large, but growing all the same. In any case, the process of structural and institutional reorientation in the direction has begun and is likely to become stronger in years to come.

Substantial indigenization can be conceptualized within the content focus of the discipline. It is advocated that the main thrust of the subject should be on its own society, people, and problems. In this respect, the need to put psychology in the arena of social change and national development, and make it problem-oriented has been strongly advocated by D. Sinha (1966, 1969, 1973a, 1977, 1983a, 1984a, 1986), J.B.P. Sinha (1973), Pareek (1980b), and others. Pareek has rightly pointed out that the "new developments have shown that psychology has to share with other social sciences the task of contributing to the solution of the national problems, both in terms of conceptual and intervention insights" (p. vii). Indigenous issues and content are increasingly emphasized and the "crisis of relevance" is being experienced. The content of the subject is undergoing modifications and the discipline is well on the road towards indigenization. The very fact that bodies like the Indian Council of Social Science Research, and a panel of experts appointed by it have tried to identify some priority areas for research (Sinha, 1973b) is indicative of substantive indigenization that is taking place. Theoretical indigenization, according to Krishna Kumar (1979, p. 105), indicates a condition in which scientists are involved in constructing distinctive conceptual frameworks and metatheories which reflect their world-views, social and cultural experience, and perceived goals. Since concepts and theoretical frameworks are difficult to transfer wholesale from one culture to another, culturally-rooted categories and concepts for analyzing social and psychological phenomena are essential. It is this aspect of indigenization that is largely lacking as far as psychology in India is concerned. It has depended almost entirely on western theories and models, and has often uncritically applied them to Indian social reality without realizing their limited applicability. Psychologists in India so far have not evinced sufficient interest in developing culturally-rooted categories and then-own theories. Theoretical indigenization seems to be the most retarded aspect of the whole process.

Scanned by CamScanner

Four Fronts of Indigenization

Atal (1981, p. 193) has observed that in the Asian context indigenization has been pursued on four fronts: (a) the use of local materials and teaching in national and regional languages; (b) research by local scholars; (c) determination of research priorities; and (d) theoretical and methodological reorientation. Indigenization of psychology in India is taking place on all these fronts, but with varying pace and success. It is not possible to deal with them at length, only a few main points are discussed here.

Following independence, there was a move towards replacing English and the adoption of Hindi and regional languages for instruction in universities and colleges. But the implementation of this plan has been beset with many difficulties. Suitable textbooks and research literature in Hindi—what to speak of the regional languages—have not been produced. There is also reluctance on the part of most front rank psychologists in the country to give up English which is the main instrument of their maintaining linkages with their peers in the west and the mainstream psychology.

There is a real fear of being isolated from the world community of psychologists. They have shown more interest in getting recognition in the west, which is regarded as a vital factor in their professional and career advancement, and attendant fringe benefits of foreign collaboration and travel. As such, psychologists have not evinced much interest in indigenous and local materials for teaching or production of psychological literature of quality in national or regional languages. On the other hand, teachers of muffasil colleges and in many of the mushrooming universities lack not only high proficiency in English but are also denied the basic infrastructural facilities by way of laboratories and libraries. They teach in Hindi or in one of the regional languages and have churned out a fairly large number of textbooks which are usually out of date and below standard. Generally, they are veritable and unmindful complications in translation of a few outdated foreign books. They constitute best examples of "translation plagiarism". Their style is discursive and the treatment seldom scientific with greater emphasis on abstract definitions. They are full of quotations, and seldom contain suitable illustrations or discussion and analysis of the local settings and hardly any reference to many good studies conducted in the country. A gap—almost "two cultures"—has developed. It is, therefore, not surprising that it has created a kind of communication crisis between a small and active group of frontrank psychologists in a few elite centres and others who constitute the main body of scholars in the country. As far as teaching in national languages, and the creation and use of local materials are concerned, the

Scanned by CamScanner

process of indigenization, though it has been in operation for more than four decades, has not produced the desired outcome.

A significant step towards indigenization is the promotion of research by "locals" and imposing restrictions on "expatriate" research. The establishment of the ICSSR in the country is a significant step in this direction. It has made funds available to research workers in the country which they lacked earlier. But the research output has been far from satisfactory. As for restricting research by outsiders and encouraging them to have local collaborators, it is justified to some extent. In an alien culture, expatriate researchers do not always possess the requisite sensitivity and insight, and imposing foreign categories often gives a distorted picture of the social reality. But these restrictions have often been guided by political rather than academic considerations which cannot always be justified.

The third dimension of indigenization is the promotion of research on topics and themes that are considered relevant and nationally important. As has already been observed, this has been one of the main considerations that has goaded indigenization of research in psychology. In recent years, emphasis on relevant and problem-oriented research has been strong among psychologists in India (D. Sinha, 1973a, 1986; J.B.P. Sinha, 1973). There has also been an attempt on the part of the ICSSR to lay down some research priorities. A few topics considered highly relevant have been enumerated (Sinha, 1973b). But defining priorities is beset with problems. It is difficult to reach a consensus on priorities, and there are problems in evolving satisfactory criteria. Academically, there is not much to commend rigid priorities and strait jacketing of research activity.

The fourth dimension of indigenization is theoretical and methodological reorientation. In psychology, there is near total domination of models and theories indiscriminately borrowed from the west. While iconoclastic discussion about *alien* theories has little to commend, their appropriateness is always questionable. It is, therefore, not surprising that one of the main directions that indigenization in psychology has taken is a re-examination of many of the theoretical frameworks and models that have been borrowed from the west. For example, the effectiveness of the participatory model of leadership has been questioned, and a more culturally appropriate alternative model called "nurturant task leader" has been proposed (J.B.P. Sinha, 1980). Similarly, Miller, Bersoff, and Harwood (1990) taking the Indian socio-cultural context that hypothesized moral behaviour as an acceptance of social responsibilities towards persons in need, reformulated Kohlberg's theory and suggested that Indian judgement reflected the moral code

Copyrighted material

Scanned by CamScanner

that tended to give priority to social duties while the judgements of Americans reflected a code that gave priority to individual rights.

This is one of the most significant dimensions of indigenization. But there has not been much effort towards linking these borrowed models to cultural realities and of modifying them suitably. It is noteworthy that psychologists in India have paid little attention to developing their own theories which can serve as alternatives to those implanted from the west. However, the situation seems to be gradually changing in the last decade or so.

Measurement of Indigenization

Indigenization of psychology in India has been discussed and documented by Sinha (1986) citing examples of indigenous orientation, concepts, culturally suitable methods, conceptual analysis and discussion of the findings of studies conducted since independence. The gradual stages through which the process is unfolding has also been outlined. In contrast, Adair and his colleagues have adopted an empirical approach. They have content-analyzed papers published in some journals over a period of time (1972–1974, 1978–1980 and 1984–1988) and have examined the way in which the process is developing in gradual stages. Indigenization has been operationalized as the extent to which the concepts, problems, hypotheses, methods, and tests: (a) emanate from, (b) adequately represent, and (c) reflect back upon the cultural context in which behaviour is observed (Adair, 1992a; Adair, Puhan & Vohra, 1993, p. 149). In other words, reference to culture in locating and formulating the problems for research, adopting methods for data collection that are appropriate for the local sample, and reference to culture in the interpretation and discussion of the findings are the main features of indigenization. In short, reference to culture is essential. Empirical research was scaled as making increasingly indigenous contributions if (a) differences between India and the west were identified, (b) differences within India or between Indian and non-western cultures were identified, (c) the research attempted to explain behaviours observed in the local culture, or (d) an indigenous theory or concept guided the research or its interpretation (Adair, 1992a). Fundamental to the approach is the belief that indigenousness develops by degrees and that increments can be measured in terms of a change in the content, methods, problem development, hypotheses, and interpretations of published research results (Adair, 1992a, p. 63).

Using these indicators, comparisons of the extent of

Copyrighted material
Scanned by CamScanner

ch Images Maps Play YouTube News Gmail Drive More priya.malhan23@gmail.com
Books Added to Favorites Write review Contents

indigenization in Bangladesh, Canada, and India were made. As far as the Indian situation is concerned, though the percentage of studies making either slight or modest reference to the cultural context were virtually constant over the period, articles with substantial reference to cultural variables noticeably increased in recent times. However, indigenous cultural elements have not yet become the focus of study (Adair, 1992a, p. 65). As far as methodology is concerned, by and large there was continued dependence on psychological tests standardized in western culture "indicative of continuing insensitivity to the special characteristics of Indian sample" (p. 66). As Adair (1992a) has observed, "indigenous methodology appears in many respects to be slower to develop than cultural problem sensitivity and the development of indigenous concepts" (p. 67). The identification of native differences and the development or adaptation of tests into one of the local languages were the most common forms of indigenous contributions. There were a few reported attempts to adopt special methods to meet the needs of local subjects, and such attempts have increased in recent years (Adair, Puhan & Vohra, 1993, p. 160). Further, in the interpretation and discussion of the findings, there was only a slight or modest reference to the cultural context, though it tended to increase over time. However, substantial reference to cultural variables noticeably increased only in the most recent period (p. 67). As for identification or resolution of social problems —an important indicator of indigenization—Indian research was found to be "very poor in its social problem contribution" (pp. 67–68). There did not seem to be a shift towards applied research or towards problems of national concern.

Adair (1992a) has also content-analyzed Indian authored articles published in foreign journals. Compared with articles published in Indian journals, they provide considerable evidence of cultural focus in more meaningful ways. "The research published abroad was of better quality…and of a more indigenous or culturally sensitive nature compared to research published in India" (p. 69). The general conclusion that seems to emerge from these studies is that there has been "some slight movement towards an indigenous discipline" (Adair, Puhan & Vohra, 1993, p. 149).

Some Specific Examples of Indigenization

Space does not permit dealing at length with specific examples of indigenization. Only a few cases are discussed briefly to illustrate different ways in which the process is in operation especially on the

Scanned by CamScanner